

Kentucky Agricultural Development Board

Minutes of the October Board Meeting

A special meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Development Board convened on **Friday, October 17, 2003** at **9:00 a.m.**, at the Franklin County Cooperative Extension Office. The purpose of this special meeting was to review investments made over the last few years and plan and prioritize for the future.

Guests and Staff Present¹

Staff – Jeff Belcher, David Bratcher, Laurie Dudgeon, Penny Durham, Edith Fultz, Sandy Gardner, Bill Hearn, Kara Keeton, Marjorie May, Bill McCloskey, Joel Neaveill, Brad Nelson, Gene Royalty (CEO), Brad Wellons, Steve Yates **Guests** – Kathi Marshall, Governor's Office of Policy Management; Blake Oliver, Community Farm Alliance (CFA); Charlie Ison, CFA; Bill Atkins, Governor's Commission on Family Farms; Representative John Will Stacy; Dr. Bill Brundage, Office of the New Economy; Dr. Lee Todd, President of University of Kentucky; Dave Maples, Kentucky Cattlemen's Association

Introductions

Gene Royalty opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the Extension Office. Mr. Royalty noted the importance of this meeting to the program and that staff had been working diligently to prepare for this meeting. Mr. Royalty turned the meeting over to the facilitator, Mark Manuel.

Mr. Manuel, Empower Kentucky, introduced himself. Mr. Manuel reviewed the agenda for the day, and he thanked the Franklin County Extension Office and Keenan Bishop, Agriculture & Natural Resource Agent, for letting us use their facilities.

Mr. Manuel noted to guests that there are comment sheets for their input, since the meeting agenda is tight.

Review Accomplishments to Date

Mr. Manuel yielded the floor to Mr. Neaveill Neaveill, Deputy Director for Policy and Administration.

Mr. Neaveill laid out the goal for this section of the agenda: develop a common understanding of progress, status, and activities to date. Mr. Neaveill utilized a slideshow presentation to illustrate the above.

Mr. Neaveill reviewed the model program financial information: dollars approved, dollars disbursed, and dollars reported.

Mr. Neaveill reviewed County Model Program Activity by program:

Genetics – provided a breakdown of bull breeds cost-shared; breakdown of semen breeds cost-shared; and a comparison of "bill of sale" amount vs. cost-share amount

¹ Official attendance of the Board is listed in the "regular meeting" section of the minutes.

Forage – provided a breakdown by investment area (e.g. seed/fertilize); reviewed the top five counties in reporting seed/fertilize, filter fabric, rotational, etc.

Goat – provided a breakdown by investment area (e.g. breeding stock); reviewed the top five counties in reporting breeding stock, etc.

Diversification – provided a breakdown by investment area (e.g. equine #1, dairy #2); reviewed the top cost-share items in the top investment areas; noted that most of the top cost-share areas are for inputs and construction materials – promotional items seem to be at the bottom

Non-model Projects: County – reports indicate completion of most cost-level projects. Some request timeline modifications.

Non-model Projects: State – reports indicate that most are well underway but not enough time has passed to evaluate their success.

Mr. Neaveill presented conclusions drawn from this information:

1. We have received 70% of the model program reports;
2. There is a need for modifications in program reporting forms for better clarity by program administrators;
3. Agreements should be strengthened related to reporting requirements/deadlines; and
4. Staff should conduct a training session for program administrators to communicate the importance of thorough and accurate program reporting.

Performance Standards for Projects

Mr. Manuel opened the floor for questions or comments.

How do reports flow to the state office; do they come directly to the office without going through the County Agricultural Development Council?

Yes, the reports come directly to the state office without the Council seeing them.

Dean Smith wondered if that was right for the reports to skip the Council.

How are funds disbursed?

The process for disbursing funds once a project or program is approved:

- 1) A legal agreement drafted and sent to those awarded,
- 2) The administrator of the project sends a signed copy back to the office,
- 3) The agreement is signed by the CEO and a check request is sent to the Finance Cabinet, and
- 4) The check is sent back to GOAP for mailing to the project administrator, at this time copies are made for the project's file.

Is all of the money sent to the administrator in a lump sum?

If the administrator requests a lump sum payment, then yes the lump sum is sent to them. The administrator may also request a smaller portion of the award.

If a program administrator has not reported, is additional money being held?

Yes.

If the administrator has not used all of the money, can the council request the rest back?

Yes. Some administrators request transfers between programs of leftover funds. If there is a transfer of funds, then the county council must bless it.

There was discussion of sending the reports through the County Councils and having at least the Chairperson sign-off. It was noted that the statute sets the County Council's responsibilities.

What is a program is not following the guidelines, e.g. a bull is being sold multiple times?

The Board's agreement is with the program administrator, and it is their responsibility to care of these types of issues. If staff hears of these issues, then it is our responsibility to contact the program administrator to investigate the issue and follow through with any action. The local applicant is not legally bound to us, but to the administrator.

Dean Smith noted that we do not want the County Council involved in the enforcement end, which is a different issue from signing off on reporting forms.

Vickie Yates Brown wondered if it is necessary to think about a three party agreement, to include the County Council with regards to reporting. Mr. Bratcher questioned having them become part of the legal agreement.

Discussion occurred about what it means for a Council to "sign-off" on the reports.

Mr. Moore noted that we [the Board] are not talking about changing the guidelines, but enforcing the guidelines.

Ms. Brown noted that maybe there does not need to be a three party agreement every time, but a letter of understanding of responsibilities. Mr. Manuel clarified if this letter is a definition of roles.

New Policy & Procedure Item:

Mr. Manuel gathered consensus that the

County Council gets the quarterly reports before they come to the state. When the Council "signs-off," they are saying that they have reviewed it and have noted any concerns raised by the report. The chairperson of the Council signs-off.

Additional discussion about staff still needing reports electronically, and a suggestion that dual signatures be provided when the Council "signs-off."

Mr. Bratcher noted that we should still be the ones in contact with the administrators when reports are missing, not solely the Council, though the Council will know and may want to contact on their own.

Dean Smith noted that he is concerned a lot of the model program money going to inputs and expendables.

Discussion of what happens if an issue comes to light.

Policy & Procedure Item:

If an indiscretion comes to light:

then the council is notified, the council notifies the state and the state follows up with the administrator on the issue.

Fiscal agent > County Council > Board/staff works with Fiscal agent

Investigation? Fiscal agent responsible for investigating any issues

Plaintiff? Fiscal agent w/advice from staff legal counsel

Discussion of the importance of reporting and monitoring. Although it will not solve all problems, it may deter future problems if it is known that somebody is watching.

Staff Action Item:

Staff will develop document outlining the roles of each party.

Broadened to look at existing template legal agreements – strengthen or revise?

New Policy & Procedure:

Non-model project monitoring – State Board responsible for monitoring and informing the County Councils who have put money into the project.

Staff will investigate regional/state project issues.

A discussion of what could/should be put up on the website with regards to non-model programmatic reports.

The question of amnesty was raised, but it was determined that [the Board] does not have the right to grant amnesty, if someone has committed a crime.

Dean Smith noted that Performance Standards – outcomes – are our other responsibility. How are we [the Board] going to assess projects? Two years from now, how are we going to know what is successful? This is not a legal issue, but is as equally important.

David inquired about what needs (e.g. type of analysis) to be done with the data once it is received.

Mr. Manuel noted that other organizations have problems with performance measures:

- 1.) Input measures (how much spent etc.)
- 2.) Output measures (data we ask from the administrator)
- 3.) Outcome measures – these are the toughest to determine

Assessment Analysis Discussion:

Dean Smith noted that there might be a need to investment in an assessment/analysis of investments. The question arises of who to pay – outside consultant or staff – and how to break it down – (e.g. sector by sector: cattle, vegetable etc.).

Eddie Sellers noted that until reporting can catch up personal testimony would be a powerful tool.

Vickie Brown does not disagree about testimonials, which will be helpful during the General Session; however, we [the Board] will have to have the data. Ms. Brown suggested hiring someone to do an outcome assessment, and then asked the question ‘what kind of information does that person need?’

Dean Smith asked if staff is in a position to do this or should it come from an outside source. Mr. Royalty indicated that this is a possibility, but a new position may need to be created. Mr. Bratcher noted that staff’s current focus is getting data from those who have not reported; additionally, there is not the expertise in-house to do the analysis.

Dean Smith suggested that a Request for Proposals (RFP) be issued to education institutions, specializing in agricultural economics, for a grant to do the analysis.

Current County Programs and Long-term Goals

Mr. Bratcher posed the following questions: “Are we asking right question(s)?” “Where do we want to be?”; and “What’s the goal for these enterprises?”

There was agreement among several members that the Board needs to look at where to go to tie it all together. It was noted that, though marketing was considered the number one priority in the long-term plan, farmers continue to revert to production cost-share with the model programs.

There was debate on limiting or fading out some of the county model programs versus providing more options, while continuing all the current programs.

Mike Slaughter noted that originally the counties were charged to devise a plan. He suggested that the Councils need to look at where they have been and where they need to go and assess their plans. If needs a priorities have changed within the counties, then the plans can be updated to reflect that.

Joel pointed out that, though there is a 35/65 split between the county and state funds, there is less state money available than total county money after line item commitments are subtracted from the state portion. Therefore, the board will need to be more focused on which state projects are approved.

Mr. Manuel reviewed the direction discussed: long-term priorities > review long term plan > counties review county plans > see if there is “something better”,

Prioritizing Projects

Are there caps in the model programs limiting the number of times each program can be accessed?

Only the Agricultural Diversification Program has a dollar limit for the life of the program.

Mr. Manuel posed the question, “How do you review this long-term plan and come up with “something better?”

Ms. Harkins suggested that the Board look at the areas of focus in the long-term plan and then look at the products being produced.

Ms. Harkins asked if the current market structure should be fed or should something out of the box be done. Discussion indicated that both should be pursued.

Impact on tobacco dependency was discussed as a possible “outcome measure.”

There was discussion of how to step outside the box. The Board is dependent on who walks through the door; how can industry be lured here to provide markets for our products?

Ms. Brown suggested that RFPs be done for specific investments (e.g. livestock slaughter).

Dean Smith cautioned against committing to expend a specific dollar amount for those investment areas. Ms. Brown added that in sending the RFP out, it would be clear that there are no strings attached to fund anything, if viable proposals are not submitted.

There was brief discussion of the Community Farm Alliance marketing proposal. Ms. Harkins noted that it is missing the market/retail/wholesale component.

Dean Smith suggested that maybe a model marketing program in something on which the Board needs to work.

Ms. Harkins presented a plan from the private sector, “Preserving the Vision,” which is about keeping the tobacco money between Education, Health and Agriculture. This campaign seeks to keep the Tobacco Settlement Fund coming to those currently receiving. Local news, radio, newspaper, and other media outlets will be used. Ms. Harkins noted that private organizations in Education and Health have already committed to this campaign. There was discussion of the monetary commitments and other specifics of this campaign. It was pointed out that there is some strong language at the end of the plan that caused concern for some members.

[There was a short break.]

Presentation of “West Liberty Project”

Gene Royalty introduced Governor Paul E. Patton and Lee Todd, University of Kentucky President. Mr. Royalty noted that there is no application or applicant for this project; this is just an informational presentation.

Mr. Royalty yielded the floor to Governor Patton. Governor Patton thanked the Board for the work that they have done over the last three years. He noted that their personal involvement has made a difference, making the process work the way it should. Governor Patton charged the Board not to subsidize farmers, but to make existing crops and practices more profitable; new opportunities for agriculture; get out of the main stream; and take a chance. The Board may invest in projects that do not work out. He noted that if everything approved works, then the Board has failed, because nothing new was tried. He thanked the Board, again, for the opportunity to work with them and serve on the Board with them.

Governor Patton provided background for the project being presented. He recognized Representative John Will Stacy's presence and introduced Dr. Todd.

Commissioner Smith interjected a comment of appreciation to Governor Patton for his leadership and foresight.

Dr. Todd reviewed issues of concerns to agriculture and how a proposed partnership between Belkan Partners, the University of Kentucky and the Agricultural Development Board could address those issues with a system for gathering data, which could be accessed by producers, marketers, etc. The potential exists for the Agricultural Development Board to become part owners for this ag-based product that can be marketed to the rest of the world. Dr. Todd shared other aspects of the project and entertained questions about the distance learning component, the management tools, and the partnership.

Mr. Hunt asked if this is something that would fit with the Kentucky Agricultural Finance Corporation (KAFC). Mr. Bratcher indicated that KAFC does not have the authority to own intellectual property.

[BREAK for lunch.]

Regular Business Meeting

The regular business meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Development Board was held on **Friday, October 17, 2003** at **1:00 p.m.**, at the Franklin County Cooperative Extension Office. Commissioner Billy Ray Smith, presiding, called the meeting to order, and the Secretary called the roll.

Roll Call

Members Present

Vickie Yates Brown, Daniel Case, Susan Harkins, Wayne Hunt, Sam Lawson, Smith Mitchell, Sam Moore, Willa H. Poynter, Eddie Sellers, Mike Slaughter, Sidney Stewart, Commissioner Billy Ray Smith, M. Scott Smith

Members Absent

Larry Clay, Governor Paul E. Patton

Notification of Media

Commissioner Smith received verification from Gene Royalty that the media had received notice regarding the Agricultural Development Board meeting.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 19, 2003 meeting were approved as presented.

Referral of August Projects²

Commissioner Smith presented projects A2003-0574 to A2003-0604 for referral to the Board's Project Review Committees. Mike Slaughter moved that projects A2003-0574 to A2003-0604 be referred the Board's Project Review Committees; Wayne Hunt seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Approval of Model Programs³

Mr. Royalty submitted project A2003-0380 as a project meeting the model **Agricultural Diversification Program** guidelines.

Mr. Royalty submitted project A2003-0561 as a project meeting the model **Forage Improvement & Utilization Program** guidelines.

Mr. Royalty submitted projects A2003-0532, A2003-0537, A2003-0565, and A2003-0521 as projects meeting the model **Genetics Improvement Program** guidelines.

² A detailed list of the referred projects is attached as Appendix A.

³ A detailed list of projects funded under each model program category is attached as Appendix B.

Mr. Royalty submitted projects A2003-0579, A2003-0562, A2003-0526, A2003-0567, and A2003-0540 as projects meeting the model **Goat Diversification Program** guidelines.

Mr. Royalty submitted projects A2003-0531, A2003-0538, and A2003-0553 as projects meeting the model **Cattle Handling Facilities Program** guidelines.

Mr. Royalty submitted projects A2003-0551, A2003-0543, A2003-0534, and A2003-0581 as projects meeting the model **Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage Program** guidelines.

Mike Slaughter moved that the above projects be approved as the specified model programs, as presented; Sidney Stewart seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Review of Amendments

Mr. Royalty presented the following amendment for approval:

Application **A2002-0675, Kentucky Thoroughbred Owners and Breeders, Inc.**, was approved for \$190,000.00 on March 31, 2003. The applicant requests to expand the scope of the work being performed with this project to include investigations with the Eastern Tent Caterpillar as a contributor for the spontaneous abortion phenomenon, which occurred in 2002 (a.k.a. Mare Reproductive Loss Syndrome (MRLS)). Susan Harkins moved that A2002-0675 be amended as stated; Smith Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Application **A2002-0313, Jessamine County Beef Cattle Association**, was approved for \$54,000.00 on May 17, 2002. The applicant requests a decrease of \$10,000 for the Handling Facilities program. The funds are to be reallocated to the Cattle Genetics program [A2003-0565]. Approval of this request would bring the project total to \$44,000. Sam Moore moved that A2002-0313 be amended as stated; Danny Case seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Applications **A2001-0440 / A2001-0578**. The applicant, **Bath County Cattlemen's Association** requests that \$37,099.10 in project funds from A2001-0440 (Genetics) be reallocated to A2001-0578 (Handling). Danny Case moved that A2001-0440 and A2001-0578 be amended as stated; Sidney Stewart seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

This concluded the regular business meeting.

(Continuation of Planning Session)**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

[Discussion limit: 20 minutes]

Discussion: What does the Board thinks should happen to the staff of the Board and do you want to provide a recommendation to the transition team?

In light of the upcoming election and the transition team that will follow, staff is looking for an opinion from the Board about this issue. Joel spoke to this and why it was being discussed, since this issue has been discussed before at other meetings. If an opinion exists, staff wants to include it in presentation to the next Governor.

There was interest in meeting with the candidates to see what their viewpoint of this Board is. However, several felt that it was too close to the election and the candidates would not have time. Others indicated that both candidates have similar answers regarding agriculture and that 50% commitment of Tobacco Settlement Funds going to this effort.

Some indicated that the effort needs General Assembly pressure and backing to make sure it continues.

The consensus is to keep the Board's staff in the Governor's Office. It was also noted that this lends credibility to the Board, the importance of the effort and the amount of responsibility.

What happens at the change of administration to Board appointees?

Currently there are four appointees who must be confirmed by the house and senate, during the next legislative session. The new Governor will have opportunity to appoint or reappoint [4] members in June 2004. Members who have already been confirmed will remain on the Board.

There was discussion of the GOAP budget request and staffing limits.

Prioritizing Project - continued

There was a comparison of the CFA marketing proposal and Long-term Plan Marketing Priority.

Current fiscal information reviewed:

\$ 26.0 million	Amount of State Funds Requested in Pending Applications
\$ 12.0 million	State Fund Balance
- 7.0 million	- Earmarked for Marketing
\$ 5.0 million	Uncommitted State Funds
\$ 1.2 million	Funds remaining in Entrepreneurship Program Fund
\$ 11.0 million	Balance of April 2004 payment after earmarks removed

The issue of the “Amount of money left” vs. the “Amount of funds requested” was discussed. Which projects/types does the Board need to focus money towards?

The Entrepreneurship Program/KCADE was discussed. Some feel that the program has not developed as originally intended. It was pointed out that though the organizational structure may not be exactly what was envisioned, the mission of the Program and Center has been maintained with most of the goals and objectives being met.

Board Review Process and Focus on Limited Funds

Since there is now a limited amount of funds available, which did not exist before, suggestions were made on how to best maximize the review process, so that the Boards priorities are realized in an efficient and effective manner.

Suggestions:

- Review projects on quarterly basis; still do project review
- Set limits on the amount of funds awarded (e.g. 1/6 of funds available for commitment each quarter between now and March 2005)
- Develop a scoring system to use in evaluating projects, so that certain minimums are met and those that do not meet a certain threshold number are automatically removed from consideration. Of those left for consideration, some will be approved; some will be denied; and some will be moved forward to the next quarter to compete with those applications.
- Review projects monthly, but only fund on a quarterly basis
- Overlap Board Project Review Committees on months without state funding decisions to take action on model programs, amendments and possibly non-model county fund applications. (If only funding state on a quarterly basis) [Blue > 30 minute overlap: Board Meeting > Red]
- Allocate money per area: marketing, leadership, etc.
- Allocate money by quarter
- Provide flexibility in new process for that “next great project”
- Increase the cost-share ratio for certain projects based on a percent of their sales, etc. or provide a down payment and let KAFC do a loan

REVIEW of PREVIOUS DISCUSSION

Mr. Manuel tried to gather consensus on the issue of how to stretch the money:

- 1) Take areas in the Long-term Plan and allocate funds to each; or
- 2) Allocate money per quarter with two review/mini board meetings and one normal board meeting.

Dean Smith noted that this cannot really be done by category.

Sam Lawson noted that he does not like idea of staff culling applications, so that they do not get to the board.

Mr. Manuel asked how the amount per quarter is to be determined. Dean Smith said flexibly; it should be set as a “target,” rather than a hard number.

Mr. Manuel posted large issues of concern to the Board on a sheet: 1) Inputs/Expendables; 2) Marketing Complications; and 3) Lobbying Legislature.

Mr. Bratcher noted that, including this quarter, there are six quarters between now and March 2005 (the end of fiscal year 2005). Dividing the amount of funds by six gives \$3.8 million per quarter.

Criteria Discussion

What kind of criteria should be used to prioritize projects?

Mr. Bratcher asked if the Board wants staff to develop criteria to score projects. Staff will indicate if a project is “qualified” or “not qualified” and the Board will decide the approval or denial recommendation.

New Policy/Procedure:

Staff > determines if a project is qualified or not; pseudonyms for fund or deny (either may be pended, though)

Board > determines priorities and ranks projects, then provides recommendation

It was determined that each committee will still review only ½ of the project applications; both committees can still discuss another committee’s project, though.

Another meeting structure was suggested in which both Board Project Review Committees would meet at same time in the morning and have a regular meeting in the afternoon.

What are we doing next month?

The current meeting schedule will be maintained for November, due to the volume of projects to be reviewed.

What are we doing in December?

It was decided that Board Project Review day and Board meeting day would be combined. December will be the first month for this schedule. However, the breakup of the day has not been determined: Project Review in the morning and Board in the afternoon, versus, Project Review occurring during the Board meeting.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Royalty announced that Governor Patton would be honored at the Farm City Luncheon by some of the agricultural organizations. This luncheon is during the North American Livestock Expo and is the same day as the November Project Review. Therefore, Board Project Review will be at the Kentucky Fair and Expo Center South Wing Board Room: Blue Committee will begin at 8:30 a.m.; the luncheon starts at 11:30 a.m.; and Red Committee will begin at 1:30 p.m. More details will follow when the minutes are distributed.

The next meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Development Board will convene at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, November 21, 2003 at KY History Center. Note time and location of meeting subject to change; ample notification will be given if such a change occurs.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

PRESIDING OFFICER: _____

SECRETARY: _____

Appendix A: New Applications for Referral

<i>Appl #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Project Type</i>
A2003-0574	Christian County Conservation District	Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage
A2003-0575	Christian County Conservation District	On-farm Water Enhancement
A2003-0576	West Kentucky Corporation for the Agritourism Advisory Council	Agricultural Diversification
A2003-0577	Boones Abattoir, Inc.	Project
A2003-0578	Family Farm Project Cooperative Association	
A2003-0579	Central Kentucky Meat Goat Producers Inc.	Goat Diversification
A2003-0580	Breckinridge County Beef Improvement Council Inc.	Forage Improvement
A2003-0581	Trigg County Cattlemen's Association	Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage
A2003-0582	Grant County Cattlemen's Association	Forage Improvement
A2003-0583	Green River Area Development District	Agricultural Diversification
A2003-0584	Four Rivers Sport Horse Complex	Project
A2003-0585	Commodity Growers Cooperative Association, Inc	Project
A2003-0586	Buffalo Trace Area Development District	Project
A2003-0587	Green River Area Development District, Inc.	Goat Diversification
A2003-0588	Breckinridge County Beef Improvement Council, INC	Forage Improvement
A2003-0589	Madison County Beef Cattle Association	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2003-0590	Kentucky Center for Agricultural Development	Project
A2003-0591	West Kentucky Corporation	Agricultural Diversification
A2003-0592	Green River Produce Marketing Cooperative	Project
A2003-0593	Warren County Conservation District	Forage Improvement
A2003-0594	Warren County Cattle Producers	Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage
A2003-0595	Warren County Cattle Producers Association	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2003-0596	S.S. Enterprises	Project
A2003-0597	Boone's Abattoir, Inc.	Project

Appendix A: New Applications for Referral

<i>Appl #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Project Type</i>
A2003-0598	Murray State University Foundation, Inc.	Project
A2003-0599	Green River Area Beef Improvement Council	Handling Facilities Cost Share
A2003-0600	Buffalo Trace Area Development District	Agricultural Diversification
A2003-0601	Robertson County Soil Conservation District	Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage
A2003-0602	Kentucky Specialty Grains	Project
A2003-0603	Cumberland Farm Products	Project
A2003-0604	Cumberland Farm Products	Project

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Agricultural Diversification***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0380	Magoffin County Horse Association	Magoffin	\$32,550.00
		Sub Total	\$32,550.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Fencing Improvement***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0561	Clark County Conservation District	Clark	\$81,000.00
		Sub Total	\$81,000.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Forage Improvement***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0533	Jackson Purchase Resource Conservation and Development Foundation, Inc.	Graves	\$6,000.00
		Sub Total	\$6,000.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Genetics Improvement***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0532	Jackson Purchase Resource Conservaton and Development Foundation, Inc.	Graves	\$17,389.00
A2003-0537	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Henderson	\$10,600.00
A2003-0565	Jessamine County Beef Cattle	Jessamine	\$10,000.00
A2003-0521	Rowan County Fiscal Court	Rowan	\$27,999.00
Sub Total			\$65,988.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Goat Diversification***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0579	Central Kentucky Meat Goat Producers Inc.	Casey	\$49,900.00
A2003-0562	Clark County Goat Producers Associations, Inc.	Clark	\$25,000.00
A2003-0526	Eastern Kentucky Goat Producer's Association, Inc.	Estill	\$300.00
A2003-0567	Franklin County Goat Producers Association	Franklin	\$10,000.00
A2003-0540	Jessamine County Goat Producers Inc.	Jessamine	\$15,000.00
		Sub Total	\$100,200.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Handling Facilities Cost Share***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0531	Jackson Purchase Resource Conservation and Development Foundation, Inc.	Graves	\$6,000.00
A2003-0538	Green River Area Beef Improvement Group, Inc.	Henderson	\$15,000.00
A2003-0553	Webster County Pest Management, Inc.	Webster	\$5,204.00
Sub Total			\$26,204.00

Appendix B: County Model Programs List***Hay, Straw and Commodity Storage***

<i>App #</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Funds</i>
A2003-0551	Green River Area Development District, Inc.	Hancock	\$75,000.00
A2003-0543	Jessamine County Beef Cattle Association, Inc.	Jessamine	\$25,000.00
A2003-0534	Rowan County Fiscal Court	Rowan	\$20,000.00
A2003-0581	Trigg County Cattlemen's Association	Trigg	\$50,000.00
Sub Total			\$170,000.00